



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3637
#2/Argument
6-18-03
JH

Applicant: Sharon Johnson)
Serial No.: 09/881,462)
Filed: 6/14/01) Group Art Unit 3637
For: A STUDENT WORK STATION) Examiner Jose V. Chen

SECOND RESPONSE

Box Amendment/No-Fee
Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
JUN 12 2003
GROUP 3600

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of February 25, 2003, please consider the following.

REMARKS

In an attempt to resolve the issues presented herein, applicant's attorney requested a telephone conference with Examiner Chen on May 7, 2003, but such conference did not occur.

In her First Response, the Applicant traversed the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In addition, Applicant pointed out certain advantages of the instant invention over the cited prior art. In reply to Applicant's First Response, the current office action reasserts the same grounds of rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a), without addressing the arguments raised by the Applicant in the First Response, which arguments the Examiner considered to be moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

No new grounds of rejection have been asserted in the current